

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending and were examined. Claims 1-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 11 has been amended. Claims 1-25 remain for consideration. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-8, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,079,839 to Conrad et al (hereinafter the Conrad reference) in view of United States Patent No. 5,788,995 to Brams et al (hereinafter the Brams reference). These rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner alleges that Conrad discloses a method for producing a shaving cartridge comprising the steps of forming a base having features for attaching the shaving aid cartridge to a razor assembly and forming a shaving body attached to the base during the forming of the shaving aid body. However, the Examiner states that Conrad does not show a specific insert molding process.

The Conrad reference is merely seen to disclose the molding of a lubricating strip to a cap portion of a razor structure. Unlike Applicants' claim 1, Conrad is not seen to disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites:

"1. A method for producing a shaving aid cartridge, comprising the steps of: forming in a first mold a base having features for attaching the shaving aid cartridge to a razor assembly, the first mold including a base portion and a common portion; engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold, the common portion containing the formed base; and forming in the second mold a shaving aid body attached to the formed base."

Since the Conrad reference is not seen to disclose, teach or suggest, inter alia, the step of forming a base having features for attaching the shaving aid cartridge to a razor assembly nor any specific insert molding process, as the Examiner concedes, it is respectfully submitted that the Conrad reference fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the Brams reference shows that it is known to carry out a method including forming in a first mold an element having desired features, the first mold including a base portion and a common portion; engaging the common portion of the first

mold with another desired element portion to collectively form a closed second mold, the common portion containing the previously-molded element; and forming in the second mold a desired element attached to the previously formed element. The Examiner further alleges that it would be obvious for one skilled in the art to use the Brams insert molding process to mold the Conrad article more efficiently. The Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the Brams reference.

Contrary to the Examiner's characterization, it is respectfully submitted that the Brams reference is merely seen to disclose an injection molding machine having a pair of mold-carrying plates clamped together to close the injection molding machine during molding operations. The injection molding machine can be opened by separating the mold-carrying plates to remove a molded article. The Brams injection molding machine includes a thermo-plastic mold having a transfer mold clamped between first and second halves of the thermo-plastic mold. The injection molding machine also includes a silicone mold having first and second halves between which the transfer mold can be secured. In operation, a thermo-plastic member is formed and held in the transfer mold portion of the thermo-plastic mold. Subsequently, the thermo-plastic mold and the silicone mold are opened. The transfer mold and the thermo-plastic member carried therein are moved from the thermo-plastic mold into a position between the first and second halves of the silicone mold. The silicone mold is then closed, silicon injected into the silicone mold, and an article comprising thermo-plastic and silicon is formed.

For Example, unlike claim 1 of the present application, the Brams reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the step of engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold. Instead, operation of the mold described in the Brams reference requires an additional step to close the mold after the step of moving the transfer mold into a position between open halves of the silicone mold. Since the Brams reference is not seen to disclose, teach or suggest, inter alia, the step of engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold, it is respectfully submitted that the Brams reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1.

Moreover, moving the transfer mold as described in the Brams reference into an open mold teaches away from engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold, as recited in claim 1 of the present

application. The Applicants therefore assert that, because Brams teaches away from the present invention as recited in claim 1, that the Brams reference is not properly combinable with Conrad.

Assuming, arguendo, that the proposed combination of the Conrad and Brams references was proper, the invention recited in claim 1 of the present invention could still not be arrived at. For example the Conrad reference is not seen to disclose, teach or suggest, inter alia, the step of forming a base having features for attaching the shaving aid cartridge to a razor assembly nor any specific insert molding process. Furthermore the Brams reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the step of engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold. Neither the Conrad nor the Brams reference individually or in combination, teaches all the recitations of claim 1. Consequently, because not all of the claim recitations are taught by the cited references, Applicants' claim 1 is necessarily non-obvious. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 19-20 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Because claim 1 is asserted to be non-obvious for the reasons presented above, and because the Brams reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Conrad reference, dependent claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 19-20 are necessarily non-obvious. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 19-20 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 19-20 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Conrad and Brams references in view of United States Patent No. 5,711,076 to Yin et al (hereinafter the Yin reference). These rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

The deficiencies of the Conrad and Brams references are discussed above.

The Yin reference is merely seen to disclose a shaving system including a housing, one or more blades mounted on the housing, a cap behind the blades, and a guard structure in front of the blades on the housing. The guard structure includes flexible skin-engaging protrusions (e.g., fins) that are said to engage a user's skin in front of the blades and a water leachable shaving aid composite positioned to deliver a shaving aid to the skin behind the flexible skin-engaging protrusions. Moreover, the Yin reference does not disclose, inter alia, a soap. Instead, Yin discloses "a matrix of a water-insoluble polymer and, dispersed within the matrix, a skin

lubricating water-soluble polymer." (Yin at column 4 lines 14-16). Applicants' claim 4 depends indirectly from claim 1. Because claim 1 is asserted to be non-obvious for the reasons presented above, and because the Yin reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Conrad and Brams references, defendant claim 4 is necessarily non-obvious. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 4 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 9-11, 14, 17 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Conrad and Brams references in view of United States Patent No. 5,345,680 to Vreeland et al (hereinafter the Vreeland reference). These rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

Regarding claim 11, the Examiner alleges that Conrad discloses a method for producing a shaving cartridge comprising the steps of injecting a thermoplastic material into a closed first mold to form a base; injecting a shaving aid material into the second mold to form a shaving aid body; and removing the shaving aid body from the mold. The Examiner states that Conrad does not show using two molds.

However, without addressing the patentability of claim 11 as previously presented in view of the Conrad and Vreeland references and merely to streamline prosecution of the present application, clarifying amendments have been made to claim 11. Support for the proposed amendments to claim 11 may be found in the original disclosure at least at paragraph 0025. Thus, no new matter is presented. As stated above, the Conrad reference is merely seen to disclose the molding of a lubricating strip to a cap portion of a razor structure. Unlike Applicants' claim 11, Conrad is not seen to disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 11. For example, claim 11, as now written, recites:

"11. A method for producing a shaving aid cartridge, comprising the steps of: injecting a thermoplastic material into a closed first mold to form a base, the first mold including a base portion and a common portion; moving the common portion of the first mold thereby engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold, wherein the base remains with the common portion and is disposed within the second mold; injecting a shaving aid material into the second mold to form a shaving aid body attached to the formed base; and removing the shaving aid cartridge that includes the base coupled to the shaving aid body from the second mold."

However, the Examiner states, in pertinent part, that "Vreeland shows that it is known to carry out a method including using a first mold to form the base, the first mold including a base portion and a common portion (Column 3, lines 67-68; Column 4, line 1) and engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to form a closed second mold, wherein the base remains with the common portion and is disposed within the second mold (Column 4, lines 1-5; It is noted that the modifications needed to form the second mold are being considered the 'shaving aid body portion' of the second mold.)." See the Office Action at the paragraph spanning pages 6 and 7.

This characterization of Vreeland is respectfully disagreed with. The relevant section of Vreeland recites:

"Another embodiment of the present invention comprises a process for insert molding a flexible razor head comprising the steps of 1) securely positioning at least one blade in a mold cavity; 2) molding a flexible razor head by injecting at least one polymer, preferably polypropylene, into the mold cavity; 3) modifying said mold cavity to receive a shaving aid on the flexible razor head; and 4) subsequently injecting a polymeric blend into the modified mold cavity wherein said polymeric blend comprises:

polypropylene,
at least one polymer from the group consisting of ABS and polystyrene, and
at least one water-soluble active ingredient, preferably comprising polyethylene oxide."

See Vreeland at Col. 3, line 64 to Col. 4, line 10.

It is respectfully submitted that Vreeland merely describes providing a mold cavity for forming a flexible razor head and modifying the same mold cavity to receive a polymeric blend of a shaving aid on the flexible razor head. The Examiner asserts that the "modification" of the same mold cavity is deemed to be the introduction of the shaving aid body portion to form the second closed mold as taught by and claimed in the present invention.

However, it is not seen where Vreeland describes or suggests formation of a second closed mold by introduction of a new member, namely the shaving aid body portion. The advantages of adding a new member which, as recited in the dependent claims, provides contours to the shaving aid body, are recognized only by the Applicants and are not expressly or implicitly disclosed or suggested in Vreeland either alone or in the proposed combination with Conrad.

Since the Vreeland reference is not seen to disclose, teach or suggest, inter alia, the steps of moving the common portion of the first mold thereby engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold, it is respectfully submitted that the Vreeland reference fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 11.

It is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of Conrad and Vreeland do not suggest or make obvious, for example, moving the common portion of the first mold thereby engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold as recited in amended independent claim 11. It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 11 is deemed patentable over the teachings of the proposed combination of Conrad and Vreeland.

Claims 14, 17, 24, and 25 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11. Because claim 11 is asserted to be non-obvious for the reasons presented above, and because the Brams reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Conrad reference, defendant claims 14, 17, 24, and 25 are necessarily non-obvious. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claims 14, 17, 24, and 25 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 14, 17, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad and Vreeland, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Since independent claim 1 includes a similar limitation as claim 11, independent claim 1 and claims 9, 10, and 21-23 which directly or indirectly depend from and further limits claim 1, are deemed patentable over the teachings of the proposed combination of Conrad and Vreeland et al. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 9, 10, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad and Vreeland.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejects claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad in view of Vreeland and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,852,262 to Brown et al (hereinafter Brown). This rejection is respectfully disagreed with, and is traversed below.

The deficiencies of Conrad and Vreeland with respect to independent claim 11 are noted above.

The Examiner states "that Brown shows that it is known to carry out a method of making a shaving article comprising the step of cooling at least a portion of a second mold (Column 3, lines 16-25; Column 8, 4-10)." See the Office Action at page 9, third full paragraph.

Assuming, arguendo, that the proposed combination of Conrad, Vreeland and Brown is proper and that Brown discloses a step of cooling at least a portion of a second mold as is asserted by the Examiner, points that are neither admitted nor denied, Brown is not seen to cure the above argued deficiencies in the application of Conrad and Vreeland to the subject matter as now recited in independent claim 11 at least since the proposed combination of Conrad, Vreeland and Brown does not expressly or implicitly, describe or suggest all of the subject matter of independent claim 11, as now written. For example, it is respectfully submitted the proposed combination does not suggest or make obvious moving the common portion of the first mold thereby engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold, as recited in amended independent claim 11.

In view thercof, the proposed combination does not render claims 12 and 13 obvious, at least since claims 12 and 13, either directly or through intervening claims, depend from and further limit independent claim 11. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad, Vreeland and Brown.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejects claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad in view of Vreeland and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,595,709 to Reischl (hereinafter the Reischl reference). This rejection is respectfully disagreed with, and is traversed below.

The deficiencies of Conrad and Vreeland with respect to independent claim 11 are noted above.

With respect to claim 15, the Examiner states "that Reischl shows that it is known to carry out a process for molding thermoplastic articles wherein the material is processed into a flowable state using a screw type mixer (Column 3, lines 23-40)." With respect to claim 16, the Examiner states "that Reischl shows that it is known to carry out a process wherein at least a portion of the screw type mixer is cooled during the processing of material (Column 4, lines 7-10)." See the Office Action at pages 10 and 11.

Assuming, arguendo, that the proposed combination of Conrad, Vreeland and Reischl is proper and that Reischl discloses use of a screw type mixer in a method for producing polyaddition products and cooling the mixer during use, as is asserted by the Examiner, points that are neither admitted nor denied, Reischl is not seen to cure the above argued deficiencies in the application of Conrad and Vreeland to the subject matter as now recited in independent claim 11 at least since the proposed combination of Conrad, Vreeland and Reischl does not expressly or implicitly, describe or suggest all of the subject matter of independent claim 11, as now written. For example, it is respectfully submitted the proposed combination does not suggest or make obvious moving the common portion of the first mold thereby engaging the common portion of the first mold with a shaving aid body portion to collectively form a closed second mold, as recited in amended independent claim 11.

In view thercof, the proposed combination does not render claims 15 and 16 obvious, at least since claims 15 and 16, either directly or through intervening claims, depend from and further limits independent claim 11. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad, Vreeland and Reischl.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad in view of Vreeland and further in view of Yin. This rejection is respectfully disagreed with, and is traversed below.

The Examiner states that "Conrad, Jr. shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of claims 11 and 17 above, but he does not show a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material. Yin shows that it is known to carry out a method for making a shaving aid cartridge wherein the shaving aid body comprises a soap material (Column 4, lines 49-56)." See the Office Action at page 11, second paragraph.

Assuming, arguendo, that the proposed combination of Conrad, Vreeland and Yin is proper and that Yin disclose a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material as is asserted by the Examiner, points that are neither admitted nor denied, Yin is not seen to cure the above argued deficiencies in the application of Conrad and Vreeland to the subject matter as now recited in independent claim 11 at least since the proposed combination of Conrad, Vrceland and Yin does not expressly or implicitly, describe or suggest all of the subject matter of independent claim 11, as now written. In view thereof, the proposed combination does not render claim 18

obvious, at least since claim 18; either directly or through intervening claims, depends from and further limits independent claim 11. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad in view of Vreeland and further in view of Yin.

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein are allowable. In view of the foregoing points that distinguish Applicants' invention from those of the prior art and render Applicants' invention novel and non-obvious, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the present application, remove the rejections, and allow the application to issue.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Based on the foregoing and for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims of the application in question are in condition for allowance and an early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

No fee is believed due with the filing of this Amendment. However, if a fee is due, Applicants authorize the payment of any additional charges that may be necessary to maintain the pendency of the present application to the undersigned attorney's Deposit Account No. 503342.

Respectfully submitted,

Michaud-Duffy Group, LLP

By 

Richard R. Michaud
Registration No. 40,088
Attorney for Applicants

Michaud-Duffy Group LLP
CenterPoint
306 Industrial Park Road, Suite 206
Middletown, CT 06457-1532
Tel. No.: (860) 632-7200
Fax No.: (860) 632-8269